

REMARKS

In the April 21, 2009 Office Action, claims 1-12 stand rejected in view of prior art. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the April 21, 2009 Office Action, Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 9, and has canceled claim 2 as indicated above. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the examination of this application. Thus, claims 1 and 3-12 are pending, with claims 1 and 6 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,058,393 (Callon et al.). In response, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 6 to define the present invention over the prior art of record.

In particular, independent claims 1 and 6 have been amended to recite a fan disposed in the casing and an outlet. Further, the claims recite that the fan blows air into a room through the outlet from the casing. Applicant respectfully asserts that Callon et al. fail to disclose or to suggest a fan, and even further an outlet through which the fan blows air.

Applicant respectfully asserts that this structure is not disclosed or suggested by Callon et al. or any other prior art of record. It is well settled under U.S. patent law that for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each element of the claim within the reference. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 6, as now

amended, are not anticipated by the prior art of record. Withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Moreover, Applicant believes that the dependent claims are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claims 1 and 6, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicant believes that since the prior art of record does not anticipate independent claims 1 and 6, neither does the prior art anticipate the dependent claims.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

Prior Art Citation

In the Office Action, additional prior art references were made of record. Applicant believes that these references do not render the claimed invention obvious.

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1 and 3-12 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Todd M. Guise/
Todd M. Guise
Reg. No. 46,748

SHINJYU GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: July 6, 2009
S:\06-JUN09-SOS\DK-US030518 Amendment.doc